arXiv:1609.05995v1 [math.CO] 20 Sep 2016

Addressing Graph Products and Distance-Regular Graphs

Sebastian M. Cioabă*, Randall J. Elzinga†,
Michelle Markiewitz‡, Kevin Vander Meulen§, and Trevor Vanderwoerd¶

September 21, 2016

Abstract

Graham and Pollak showed that the vertices of any connected graph G can be assigned t-tuples with entries in $\{0, a, b\}$, called addresses, such that the distance in G between any two vertices equals the number of positions in their addresses where one of the addresses equals a and the other equals b. In this paper, we are interested in determining the minimum value of such t for various families of graphs. We develop two ways to obtain this value for the Hamming graphs and present a lower bound for the triangular graphs.

1 Graph Addressings

A *t-address* is a t-tuple with entries in $\{0, a, b\}$. An *addressing* of length t for a graph G is an assignment of t-addresses to the vertices of G so that the distance between two vertices is equal to the number of locations in the addresses at which one of the addresses equals a and the other address equals b. For example, we have a 3-addressing of a graph in Figure 1. Graham and Pollak [13] introduced such addressings, using symbols $\{*, 0, 1\}$ instead $\{0, a, b\}$, in the context of loop switching networks.



Figure 1: A graph addressing

We are interested in the minimum t such that G has an addressing of length t. We denote such a mininum by $N(G)$. Graham and Pollak [13, 14] showed that $N(G)$ equals the biclique partition number of the distance multigraph of G. Specifically, the *distance multigraph of G*, $\mathcal{D}(G)$, is the multigraph with the same vertex set as G where the multiplicity of any edge uv equals the distance in G between vertices u and v. The *biclique partition number* $\mathrm{bp}(H)$ of a multigraph H is the minimum number of complete bipartite subgraphs (bicliques) of H whose edges partition the edge-set of H. This parameter and its close covering variations have been studied by several researchers and appear in different contexts such as computational complexity or geometry (see for example, [8, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 25]). Graham and Pollak deduced that $N(G) \leq r(n-1)$ for any connected G of order n and diameter r and conjectured that $N(G) \leq n-1$ for any connected graph G of order n. This conjecture, also known as the *squashed cube conjecture*, was proved by Winkler [24].

To bound $N(G)$ below, Graham and Pollak used an eigenvalue argument on the adjacency matrix of $\mathcal{D}(G)$. Specifically, if M is a symmetric real matrix, let $n_+(M), n_-(M)$, and $n_0(M)$ denote the number of

*Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716-2553, USA; cioaba@udel.edu. Research partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1600768.

†Department of Mathematics, Royal Military College, Kingston, ON K7K 7B4, Canada; rjelzinga@gmail.com. Current address: Info-Tech Research Group, London, ON, N6B 1Y8, Canada.

‡Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716-2553, USA; mmark@udel.edu. Research supported by the Summer Scholars Undergraduate Program at the University of Delaware.

§Department of Mathematics, Redeemer University College, Ancaster, ON L9K 1J4, Canada; kvanderm@redeemer.ca. Research supported by NSERC Discovery Grant 203336.

¶Department of Mathematics, Redeemer University College, Ancaster, ON L9K 1J4, Canada; tvanderwoerd@redeemer.ca.

eigenvalues of M (including multiplicity) that are positive, negative and zero, respectively. The *inertia* of M is the triple $(n_+(M), n_0(M), n_-(M))$. The adjacency matrix of $\mathcal{D}(G)$ will be denoted by $D(G)$; we will also refer to $D(G)$ as the distance matrix of G. The inertia of distance matrices has been studied by various authors for many classes of graphs [3, 17, 18, 26]. Witsenhausen (cf. [13, 14]) showed that

$$N(G) \geq \max(n_+(D(G)), n_-(D(G))). \tag{1}$$

Letting J_n denotes the all one $n \times n$ matrix and I_n denotes the $n \times n$ identity matrix, and noting that $n_-(D(K_n)) = n_-(J_n - I_n)$, Graham and Pollak [13, 14] used the bound (1) to conclude that

$$N(K_n) = n - 1. \tag{2}$$

Graham and Pollak [13, 14] also determined $N(K_{n,m})$ for many values of n and m. The determination of $N(K_{n,m})$ for all values of n and m was completed by Fujii and Sawa [11]. A more general addressing scheme, allowing the addresses to contain more than two different nonzero symbols, was recently studied by Watanabe, Ishii and Sawa [23]. The parameter $N(G)$ has been determined when G is a tree or a cycle [14], as well as one particular triangular graph T_4 [25], described in Section 5. For the Petersen graph P, Elzinga, Gregory and Vander Meulen [10] showed that $N(P) = 6$. To the best of our knowledge, these are the only graphs G for which addressings of length $N(G)$ have been determined. We will say a t-addressing of G is *optimal* if $t = N(G)$. An addressing is *eigensharp* [19] if equality is obtained in (1).

In this paper, we study optimal addressings of Cartesian graph products and the distance-regular graphs known as triangular graphs. Let $H(n, q)$ is the Hamming graph whose vertices are the n-tuples over an alphabet with q letters with two n-tuples being adjacent if and only if their Hamming distance is 1. We give two different proofs showing that $N(H(n, q)) = n(q-1)$. This generalizes the Graham-Pollak result (2) since $H(1, q) = K_q$. We determine that the triangular graphs are not eigensharp.

2 Addressing Cartesian Products

Suppose that $G_i, i = 1, \ldots, k$ are graphs and that each graph G_i has vertex set $V(G_i)$ and order $n_i = |V(G_i)|$. The *Cartesian product* $G_1 \Box G_2 \Box \cdots \Box G_k$ of $G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_k$ is the graph with vertex set $V(G_1) \times V(G_2) \times \cdots \times V(G_k)$, order $n = n_1 n_2 \cdots n_k$, and with vertices $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ and $y = (y_1, \ldots, y_k)$ adjacent if for some index j, x_j is adjacent to y_j in G_j while $x_i = y_i$ for all remaining indices $i \neq j$. Thus, if d and d_i denote distances in G and G_i, respectively, then

$$d(x, y) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} d_i(x_i, y_i) \tag{3}$$

It follows that if each G_i, $i = 1, \ldots, k$ is given an addressing, then each vertex x of G may be addressed by concatenating the addresses of its components x_i. Therefore, the parameter N is subadditive on Cartesian products; that is, if

$$G = G_1 \Box \cdots \Box G_k \tag{4}$$

then

$$N(G) \leq N(G_1) + \cdots + N(G_k) \tag{5}$$

Note that $N(G_1) + \cdots + N(G_k) \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k} n_i\right) - k \leq \left(\prod_{i=1}^{k} n_i\right) - 1 = n - 1$. Thus (5) can improve on Winkler's upper bound of $n - 1$ when G is a Cartesian product.

Question 2.1. *Must equality holds in (5) for all choices of G_i?* Remark 3.4 might provide a possible counterexample.

3 Distance Matrices of Cartesian Products

If $v_1, \ldots, v_n$ denote the vertices of a connected graph G, the distance matrix $D(G)$ of G is the $n \times n$ matrix with entries $D(G)_{ij} = d(v_i, v_j)$. Because G is connected, its adjacency matrix $A(G)$ and its distance matrix

$D(G)$ are irreducible symmetric nonnegative integer matrices and by the Perron-Frobenius Theorem (see [5, Proposition 3.1.1] or [12, Theorem 8.8.1]), the largest eigenvalue of each of these matrices has multiplicity 1. We call this largest eigenvalue the *Perron* value of the matrix and often denote it by ρ.

To obtain a formula for the distance matrix of a Cartesian product of graphs, we will use an additive analogue of the Kronecker product of matrices. Recall first that if A is an $n \times n$ matrix and B an $m \times m$ matrix, with $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$, then the Kronecker products $A \otimes B$ and $x \otimes y$ are defined by

$$A \otimes B = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11}B & a_{12}B & \cdots & a_{1m}B \\ a_{21}B & a_{22}B & \cdots & a_{2m}B \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ a_{m1}B & a_{m2}B & \cdots & a_{mm}B \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad x \otimes y = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 y \\ x_2 y \\ \vdots \\ x_n y \end{bmatrix} \tag{6}$$

For the additive analogue, we use the symbol $\diamond$ and define $A \diamond B$ and $x \diamond y$ by

$$A \diamond B = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11}+B & a_{12}+B & \cdots & a_{1m}+B \\ a_{21}+B & a_{22}+B & \cdots & a_{2m}+B \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ a_{m1}+B & a_{m2}+B & \cdots & a_{mm}+B \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad x \diamond y = \begin{bmatrix} x_1+y \\ x_2+y \\ \vdots \\ x_n+y \end{bmatrix} \tag{7}$$

If $G = G_1 \Box G_2 \Box \cdots \Box G_k$, then the additive property (3) implies that[1]

$$D(G) = D(G_1) \diamond D(G_2) \diamond \cdots \diamond D(G_k) \tag{8}$$

Observe that

$$A \diamond B = A \otimes J_m + J_n \otimes B \ \text{ and } \ x \diamond y = x \otimes 1_m + 1_n \otimes y \tag{9}$$

where $1_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denotes the column vector whose entries are all one. Let $0_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denote the column vector with all zero entries.

Lemma 3.1. *Let A and B be $n \times n$ and $m \times m$ real matrices respectively. If $Ax = \lambda x$ and $x^\top 1_n = \sum x_i = 0$, then $(A \diamond B)(x \diamond 0_m) = m\lambda(x \diamond 0_m)$. Also, if $1_m^T y = 0$ and $By = \mu y$, then $(A \diamond B)(0_n \diamond y) = n\mu(0_n \diamond y)$.*

Proof. We use properties of Kronecker products:

$$\begin{aligned} (A \diamond B)(x \diamond 0) &= (A \otimes J_m + J_n \otimes B)(x \otimes 1_m + 1_n \otimes 0) \\ &= Ax \otimes J_m 1_m + J_n x \otimes B 1_m + A 1_n \otimes J_m 0 + J_n \otimes B 0 \\ &= Ax \otimes J_m 1_m = \lambda m (x \otimes 1_m) \\ &= \lambda m (x \otimes 1_m + 1_n \otimes 0) = \lambda m (x \diamond 0) \end{aligned}$$

A similar argument work the vector $(0_n \diamond y)$. □

Throughout we will say a square matrix is *k-regular* if it has constant row sum k.

Lemma 3.2. *If A is ρ_A-regular and B is ρ_B-regular then $A \diamond B$ is $(m\rho_A + n\rho_B)$-regular.*

Proof. Using properties of Kronecker products,

$$\begin{aligned} (A \diamond B)(1_n \otimes 1_m) &= (A \otimes J_m + J_n \otimes B)(1_n \otimes 1_m) \\ &= A 1_n \otimes J_m 1_m + J_n 1_n \otimes B 1_m) \\ &= \rho_A m (1_n \otimes 1_m) + n\rho_B (1_n \otimes 1_m) \\ &= (\rho_A m + n\rho_B)(1_n \otimes 1_m). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $(A \diamond B)1 = (\rho_A m + n\rho_B)1$. □

Lemma 3.3. *If $G = G_1 \Box G_2 \Box \cdots \Box G_k$ and each $\mathcal{D}(G_i), i = 1, \ldots, k$ is regular then*

(a) $n_-(D(G)) \geq \sum_i n_-(D(G_i))$, and

[1] This approach was suggested by the late David A. Gregory.

(b) $n_+(D(G)) \geq 1 + \sum_i (n_+(D(G_i)) - 1)$.

Proof. Because $\mathcal{D}(G_i)$ regular, $D(G_i)\mathbf{1}_{n_i} = \rho_i \mathbf{1}_{n_i}$ where ρ_i is the Perron value of $D(G_i)$. Then $\mathbf{1}_{n_i}$ is a ρ_i-eigenvector of $D(G_i)$ and $\mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ has an orthogonal basis of eigenvectors of $D(G_i)$ that includes $\mathbf{1}_{n_i}$ as a member. Thus, Lemma 3.1 with $A = D(G_i)$ and $B = D(\Box_{j\neq i} G_j)$ implies that the $n_i - 1$ eigenvectors of $D(G_i)$ in the basis other than $\mathbf{1}_{n_i}$ contribute $n_i - 1$ orthogonal eigenvectors to the matrix $D(G)$.

An eigenvector of $D(G_i)$ with eigenvalue $\lambda \neq \rho_i$ contributes an eigenvector of $D(G)$ with eigenvalue $\lambda(n_1 n_2 \cdots n_k)/n_i = \lambda n/n_i$. This eigenvalue has the same sign as λ if $\lambda \neq 0$. Also, if $i \neq j$, then each of the $n_i - 1$ eigenvectors contributed to $D(G)$ by $D(G_i)$ is orthogonal to each of the analogous $n_j - 1$ eigenvectors contributed to $D(G)$ by $D(G_j)$. Thus, the inequality (a) claimed for n_- follows. Also, by Lemma 3.1, $\mathbf{1}_n$ is an eigenvector of $D(G)$ with a positive eigenvalue ρ, so the inequality (b) for n_+ follows. □

Remark 3.4. The inequality in Lemma 3.3 need not hold if the regularity assumption is dropped. For example, suppose $G = G_1 \Box G_1$ where G_1 is the graph on 6 vertices obtained $K_{2,4}$ by inserted an edge incident to the two vertices in the part of size 2. Then $n_-(D(G_1)) = 5$ but $n_-(D(G)) = 9 < 5 + 5$. Also, $N(G_1) = 5$, so $9 \leq N(G) \leq 10$ by (1) and (5). An affirmative answer to Question 2.1 would imply $N(G) = 10$.

If each $D(G_i)$ in (8) is regular, then Lemma 3.3 accounts for $1 + \sum_i (\operatorname{rank} D(G_i) - 1) = k - 1 + \sum_i \operatorname{rank} D(G_i)$ of the $\operatorname{rank} D(G)$ nonzero eigenvalues of $D(G)$. The following results imply that if each $D(G_i)$ is regular then all of the remaining eigenvalues must be equal to zero. Equivalently, the results will imply that if each $D(G_i)$ in (8) is regular, then equality must hold in Lemma 3.3(a) and (b).

The next result is obtained by exhibiting an orthogonal basis of $\mathbb{R}^{mn}$ consisting of eigenvectors of $A \diamond B$ when A and B are symmetric and regular.

Theorem 3.5. *Let A be a regular symmetric real $n \times n$ matrix with $A\mathbf{1}_n = \rho_A \mathbf{1}_n$ with $\rho_A > 0$ and let B be a regular symmetric matrix of order m with $B\mathbf{1}_m = \rho_B \mathbf{1}_m$ with $\rho_B > 0$. Then*

(a) $n_-(A \diamond B) = n_-(A) + n_-(B)$,

(b) $n_+(A \diamond B) = n_+(A) + n_+(B) - 1$, *and*

(c) $n_o(A \diamond B) = nm - n - m + 1 + n_o(A) + n_o(B)$.

Proof. As in Lemma 3.3, Lemma 3.1 can be used to provide eigenvectors that imply that $n_-(A \diamond B) \geq n_-(A) + n_-(B)$ and $n_+(A \diamond B) \geq n_+(A) + n_+(B) - 1$. It remains to exhibit an adequate number of linearly independent eigenvectors of $A \diamond B$ for the eigenvalue 0.

If $\mathbf{1}_n^\top x = 0$ and $\mathbf{1}_m^\top y = 0$, then

$$(A \diamond B)(x \otimes y) = (A \otimes J_m + J_n \otimes B)(x \otimes y) = Ax \otimes 0_m + 0_n \otimes By = 0_{nm}$$

This accounts for at least $(n-1)(m-1) = nm - n - m + 1$ orthogonal eigenvectors of $A \diamond B$ with eigenvalue 0. Moreover, if $Au = 0$ then $\mathbf{1}_n^\top u = 0$ and hence, by Lemma 3.1, $(A \diamond B)(u \diamond 0_m) = 0_{nm}$. Likewise, if $Bv = 0$ then $\mathbf{1}_m^\top v = 0$ and by Lemma 3.1, $(A \diamond B)(0_n \diamond v) = 0_{nm}$. If each set of vectors x, each set of vectors y, each set of vectors u and each set of vectors v that occur above are chosen to be orthogonal, then the resulting vectors $x \otimes y, u \otimes \mathbf{1}_m, \mathbf{1}_n \otimes v$ will be orthogonal. Thus, $n_o(A \diamond B) \geq nm - n - m + 1 + n_o(A) + n_o(B)$. Adding the three inequalities obtained above, we get

$$\begin{aligned} nm &= n_-(A \diamond B) + n_+(A \diamond B) + n_o(A \diamond B) \\ &\geq n_-(A) + n_-(B) + n_+(A) + n_+(B) - 1 + nm - n - m + 1 + n_o(A) + n_o(B) \\ &= nm. \end{aligned}$$

Thus equality holds in each of the three inequalities. □

Corollary 3.6. *If $G = G_1 \Box G_2 \Box \cdots \Box G_k$ and each $D(G_i), i = 1, \ldots, k$ is regular then*

(a) $n_-(D(G)) = \sum_i n_-(D(G_i))$, *and*

(b) $n_+(D(G)) = 1 + \sum_i (n_+(D(G_i)) - 1)$.

Remark 3.7. In the proof of Theorem 3.5, whether or not A and B are symmetric and regular, we always have $(A \diamond B)(x \otimes y) = 0_{nm}$ whenever $1_n^\top x = 0$ and $1_m^\top y = 0$. Thus,

$$\mathrm{Nul}(A \diamond B) \geq (n-1)(m-1)$$

for all square matrices A and B of orders n and m, respectively.

In order to apply Lemma 3.3 to the Cartesian product (4), it would be helpful to have conditions on the graphs G_i that imply that the distance matrices $D(G_i)$ are regular. The following remark gives a few examples of graphs whose distance matrix has constant row sums.

Remark 3.8. *(Regular distance matrices)*

1. If G is either distance regular or vertex transitive, then $D(G)$ is ρ-regular where ρ is equal to the sum of all the distances from a particular vertex to each of the others.

2. If G is a regular graph of order n and the diameter of G is either one or two, then $D(G)$ is ρ-regular with $\rho = 2(n-1) - \rho_A$ where ρ_A is the Perron value of the adjacency matrix A of G. For if A is the adjacency matrix of G, then $D(G) = A + 2(J_n - I_n - A) = 2(J_n - I_n) - A$. This holds, for example, when G is the Petersen graph or $G = K_n$ (the complete graph on n vertices) or when $G = K_{m,m}$ (the complete balanced bipartite graph on $n = 2m$ vertices).

Question 3.9. *What are other conditions on a graph that imply that its distance matrix is regular?*

Theorem 3.10. *Let $G = G_1 \Box G_2 \Box \cdots \Box G_k$. If $D(G_i)$ is regular and $N(G_i) = n_-(D(G_i))$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$, then $N(G) = \sum_{i=1}^k N(G_i)$.*

Proof. By the lower bound (1) and the subadditivity property (5), $\sum_i N(G_i) \geq N(G) \geq n_- D(G)$, where by Lemma 3.3(a), $n_-(D(G)) \geq \sum_i n_-(D(G_i)) = \sum_i N(G_i)$. □

Example 3.11. The Cartesian product of complete graphs, $G = K_{n_1} \Box K_{n_2} \Box \cdots \Box K_{n_k}$ is also known as a Hamming graph. By (2) and Theorem 3.10, it follows that $N(G) = \sum_{i=1}^k (n_i - 1)$. In the next section, we explore this result using a different description of the Hamming graphs.

4 Optimal Addressing of Hamming Graphs

Let $n \geq 1$ and $q \geq 2$ be two integers. The vertices of the Hamming graph $H(n, q)$ can be described as the words of length n over the alphabet $\{1, \ldots, q\}$. Two vertices $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ and $(y_1, \ldots, y_n)$ are adjacent ifand only if their Hamming distance is 1. If $n = 1$, $H(1, q)$ is the complete graph K_q. The following result, can be derived from Example 3.11, but we provide another interesting and constructive argument.

Theorem 4.1. *If $n \geq 1$ and $q \geq 2$, then $N(H(n, q)) = n(q-1)$.*

Proof. We first prove that the length of any addressing of $H(n, q)$ is at least $n(q-1)$. For $0 \leq k \leq n$, let A_k denote the distance k adjacency matrix of $H(n, q)$. The adjacency matrix of the distance multigraph of $H(n, q)$ is $D(H(n, q)) = \sum_{k=1}^n k A_k$. The graph $H(n, q)$ is distance-regular and therefore, $A_1, \ldots, A_n$ are simultaneously diagonalizable. The eigenvalues of the matrices $A_1, \ldots, A_n$ were determined by Delsarte in his thesis [9] (see also [22, Theorem 30.1]).

Proposition 4.2. *Let $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. The eigenvalues of A_k are given by the Krawtchouk polynomials:*

$$\lambda_{k,x} = \sum_{i=0}^{k} (-q)^i (q-1)^{k-i} \binom{n-i}{k-i} \binom{x}{i} \tag{10}$$

with multiplicity $\binom{n}{x}(q-1)^x$ for $x \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n\}$.

The Perron value of A_k equals $\binom{n}{k}(q-1)^k$. Thus, the Perron value of $D(H(n,q))$ equals $\sum_{k=1}^{n}\binom{n}{k}k(q-1)^k = nq^{n-1}(q-1)$ and has multiplicity one. The other eigenvalues of $D(H(n,q))$ are

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_x &= \sum_{k=1}^{n} k\lambda_{k,x} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} k \sum_{i=0}^{k} (-q)^i (q-1)^{k-i} \binom{n-i}{k-i}\binom{x}{i} \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{n} (-q)^i \binom{x}{i} \sum_{k=i}^{n} k(q-1)^{k-i}\binom{n-i}{k-i} = \sum_{i=0}^{n}(-q)^i\binom{x}{i}\sum_{t=0}^{n-i}(i+t)(q-1)^t\binom{n-i}{t} \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{n}(-q)^i\binom{x}{i}\left(nq^{n-i}-(n-i)q^{n-i-1}\right) \\
&= q^{n-1}\sum_{i=0}^{n}\binom{x}{i}(-1)^i i = \begin{cases} -q^{n-1} & \text{if } x=1 \\ 0 & \text{if } x \geq 2. \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

with multiplicity $\binom{n}{x}(q-1)^x$ for $1 \leq x \leq n$. Thus, the spectrum of $D(H(n,q))$, with multiplicities, is

$$\begin{pmatrix} nq^{n-1}(q-1) & -q^{n-1} & 0 \\ 1 & n(q-1) & q^n - 1 - q(n-1) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{11}$$

where the first row contains the distinct eigenvalues of $D(H(n,q))$ and the second row contains their multiplicities. Thus, $\max(n_-(D(H(n,q))), n_+(D(H(n,q)))) = n(q-1)$ and Witsenhausen's inequality (1) implies that $N(H(n,q)) \geq n(q-1)$.

To show $n(q-1)$ is the optimal length of an addressing of $H(n,q)$, we describe a partition of the edge-set of the distance multigraph of $H(n,q)$ into exactly $n(q-1)$ bicliques. For $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq t \leq q-1$, define the biclique $B_{i,t}$ whose color classes are

$$\{(x_1,\ldots,x_n) : x_i = t\}$$

and

$$\{(x_1,\ldots,x_n) : x_i \geq t+1\}.$$

One can check easily that if u and v are two distinct vertices in $H(n,q)$, there exactly $d_H(u,v)$ bicliques $B_{i,t}$ containing the edge uv. Thus, the $n(q-1)$ bicliques $B_{i,t}$ partition the edge set of the distance multigraph of $H(n,q)$ and $N(H(n,q)) \leq n(q-1)$. This finishes our proof. □

We remark here that the spectrum of the distance matrix of $H(n,q)$ was also computed by Indulal [17].

5 Triangular Graphs

The triangular graph T_n is the line graph of the complete graph K_n on n vertices. When $n \geq 4$, the triangular graph T_n is a strongly regular graph with parameters $\left(\binom{n}{2}, 2(n-2), n-2, 4\right)$. The adjacency matrix of T_n has spectrum

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2(n-2) & n-4 & -2 \\ 1 & n-1 & \binom{n}{2}-n \end{pmatrix} \tag{12}$$

and therefore, the distance matrix $D(T_n)$ has spectrum

$$\begin{pmatrix} (n-1)(n-2) & 2-n & 0 \\ 1 & n-1 & \binom{n}{2}-n \end{pmatrix} \tag{13}$$

Witsenhausen's inequality (1) implies that $N(T_n) = bp(D(T_n)) \geq n-1$ for $n \geq 4$.

The problem of addressing T_4 is equivalent to determining the biclique partition number of the multigraph obtained from K_6 by adding one perfect matching. This formulation of the problem was studied by Zaks [25] and Hoffman [16] (see also Section 6). Zaks proved that $N(T_4) = 4$ and hence T_4 is not eigensharp. We will reprove the lower bound of Zaks [25] in Lemma 5.2 using a technique of [10]. The argument of Lemma 5.2 will then be used to show that T_n is not eigensharp for any $n \geq 4$ in Theorem 5.3.

The *addressing matrix* of a t-addressing is the n-by-t matrix $M(a,b)$ where the i-th row of $M(a,b)$ is the address of vertex i. $M(a,b)$ can be written as a function of a and b:

$$M(a,b) = aX + bY,$$

where X and Y are matrices with entries in $\{0, 1\}$. Elzinga et al. [10] use the addressing matrix, along with results from Brandenburg et al. [4] and Gregory et al. [15], to create the following theorem:

Theorem 5.1. *[10] Let $M(a, b)$ be the address matrix of an eigensharp addressing of a graph G. Then for all real scalars a, b, each column of $M(a, b)$ is orthogonal to the null space of $D(G)$. Also, the columns of $M(1, 0)$ are linearly independent, as are the columns of $M(0, 1)$.*

In [10, Theorem 3], Elzinga et al. use Theorem 5.1 to show that the Petersen graph does not have an eigensharp addressing. We will use a similar approach on triangular graphs.

Lemma 5.2. *The triangular graph T_4 is not eigensharp, that is, $N(T_4) \geq 4$.*

Proof. Suppose T_4 is eigensharp. Let $D = D(T_4)$. By Theorem 5.1, all vectors in the null space of D are orthogonal to the columns of a 6×3 addressing matrix $M(a, b)$.

We can construct null vectors of D in the following manner, referring to the entries of the null vector as *labels*: choose any two non-adjacent vertices, and label them with zeroes. The remaining four vertices form a 4-cycle, which will be alternatingly labelled with 1 and -1, as in Figure 2.



Figure 2: T_4 with a $D(T_4)$ null-vector labelling

Let $w(a, b)$ be any column of $M(a, b)$. We claim that $w(a, b)$ has at least three a-entries, and at least three b-entries. For convenience, we'll refer to vertices corresponding to the a-entries of $w(a, b)$ as *a-vertices*. If there are no a-vertices, then since $M(a, b) = aX + bY$, one of the columns of X is the zero vector. It would follow that the columns of $M(1, 0)$ are linearly dependent, contradicting Theorem 5.1. Thus $w(a, b)$ has at least one a and at least one b entry.

Suppose $w(a, b)$ has at most 2 a-entries. There are three cases we will consider: there are two adjacent a-vertices, there are two non-adjacent a-vertices, or there is exactly one a-vertex. In each case, we will construct a null vector x of D which is not orthogonal to $u = w(1, 0)$, contradicting Theorem 5.1. We will use the labelling in Figure 2.

Suppose $w(a, b)$ has two adjacent a-vertices. Label one of the a-vertices with a zero and the adjacent a-vertex with 1. Then $x^T u = 1 \neq 0$. Suppose $w(a, b)$ has two non-adjacent a-vertices. Label the two a-vertices with 1. Then $x^T u = 2 \neq 0$. Suppose there is only one a-vertex in w. Label the a-vertex with 1. Then $x^T u = 1 \neq 0$.

Therefore, at least three positions of $w(a, b)$ have the value a. Similarly, at least three positions of $w(a, b)$ must have value b.

Since each column of $M(a, b)$ has at least three a and three b-entries, there are at least nine a, b pairings corresponding to each column. Since $M(a, b)$ has three columns, there are 27 a, b column-wise pairs in total. However the number of column-wise a, b pairs in the addressing matrix $M(a, b)$ is simply the number of edges in $\mathcal{D}(T_4)$, namely 18. This contradiction implies that T_4 is not eigensharp. □

Theorem 5.3. *The triangular graph T_n is not eigensharp for any $n \geq 4$, that is, $N(T_n) \geq n$ for all $n \geq 4$.*

Proof. Note that T_4 is an induced subgraph of T_n since K_4 is an induced subgraph of K_n. Let T be an induced subgraph of T_n isomorphic to T_4.

Suppose T_n is eigensharp. Let $M(a, b)$ be an eigensharp addressing matrix of T_n. By Theorem 5.1, the columns of $M(a, b)$ are orthogonal to any null vector of $D(T_n)$. Let w be one of the columns of $M(a, b)$. We can construct a null vector y of $D(T_n)$ by labelling the vertices corresponding to T as described in Figure 2 and labelling the remaining vertices of T_n with zeroes. In [10], it is described that the columns of an addressing matrix correspond to bicliques that partition the edgeset of $\mathcal{D}(T_n)$. Every biclique decomposition

of $\mathcal{D}(T_n)$ induces a decomposition of $\mathcal{D}(T)$, an induced subgraph of $\mathcal{D}(T_n)$. Lemma 5.2 tells us that at least 4 bicliques are needed to decompose $\mathcal{D}(T)$. Therefore, there must be at least four columns of $M(a,b)$ whose 6 entries corresponding to T have at least one a and one b. The proof of Lemma 5.2 guarantees that each of these 4 vectors, restricted to the vertices of T, has at least three a entries and three b entries. Since $\mathcal{D}(T)$ is an induced subgraph of $\mathcal{D}(T_n)$, there are the same number of edges between the corresponding vertices in the two graphs. However, a contradiction occurs: the eigensharp addressing implies that there are at least 36 edges in $\mathcal{D}(T)$, but there are in fact 18. Therefore T_n is not eigensharp. □

For the triangular graph T_5 (the complement of the Petersen graph), the following six bicliques partition the edge set of $\mathcal{D}(T_5)$:

$$\begin{aligned}\{12,13,14,15\} &\cup \{23,24,25,34,35,45\}\\ \{12,25\} &\cup \{13,14,34,35,45\}\\ \{23,24\} &\cup \{15,25,34,35,45\}\\ \{13,23,35\} &\cup \{14,24,45\}\\ \{15\} &\cup \{12,13,14,34\}\\ \{34\} &\cup \{25,35,45\}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Theorem 5.3, we know that $5 \le N(T_5) \le 6$.

6 Complete multipartite graphs $K_{2,\ldots,2}$

We note here that finding an optimal addressing of the complete multipartite graph $K_{2,\ldots,2}$ with m color classes of size 2 is a highly non-trivial open problem. It is equivalent to finding the biclique partition number of the multigraph obtained from the complete graph K_{2m} by adding a perfect matching. Motivated by questions in geometry involving nearly-neighborly families of tetrahedra, this problem was studied by Zaks [25] and Hoffman [16]. The best current results for $N(K_{2,\ldots,2}) = bp(\mathcal{D}(K_{2,\ldots,2}))$ are due to these authors (the lower bound is due to Hoffman [16] and the upper bound is due to Zaks [25]):

$$m + \lfloor \sqrt{2m} \rfloor - 1 \le N(K_{2,\ldots,2}) \le \begin{cases} 3m/2 - 1 & \text{if } m \text{ is even} \\ (3m-1)/2 & \text{if } m \text{ is odd.} \end{cases} \tag{14}$$

7 Open Problems

We conclude this paper with some open problems.

1. Must equality hold in (5) for all choices of G_i ?
2. It is known that determining $bp(G)$ for a graph G is an NP-hard problem (see [19]). This problem is NP-hard even when restricted to graphs G with maximum degree $\Delta(G) \le 3$ (see [7]). What is the complexity of finding $N(G)$ for general graphs G ? How about graphs with $\Delta(G) > 3$, or other families of graphs ?
3. What is $N(T_n)$ for $n \ge 5$?
4. The triangular graph T_n is a special case of a Johnson graph. For $n \ge m \ge 2$, the Johnson graph $J(n,m)$ has as its vertex set the m-subsets of $[n]$ with two m-subsets being adjacent if and only if their intersection has size $m-1$. The Johnson graph is distance-regular and its eigenvalues were determined by Delsarte in his thesis [9] (see also [22, Theorem 30.1]). Atik and Panigrahi [3] computed the spectrum of the distance matrix $D(J(n,m))$:

$$\begin{pmatrix} s & 0 & -\frac{s}{n-1} \\ 1 & \binom{n}{m} - n & n-1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{15}$$

where $s = \sum_{j=1}^{m} j\binom{m}{j}\binom{n-m}{j}$. Inequality (1) implies that $N(J(n,m)) \ge n-1$. What is $N(J(n,m))$?

5. The Clebsch graph is the strongly regular graph with parameters $(16, 5, 0, 2)$ that is obtained from the 5-dimensional cube by identifying antipodal vertices. The eigenvalue bound gives $N \geq 11$ and the connection with the 5-dimensional cube might be useful to find a good biclique decomposition of the distance multigraph of this graph.

6. What is $N(G)$ if G is a random graph ? Winkler's work [24], Witsenhausen inequality 1 and the Wigner semicircle law imply that $n - 1 \geq N(G) \geq n/2 - c\sqrt{n}$ for some positive constant c. Recently, Chung and Peng [6] (see also [1, 2]) have shown for a random graph $G \in \mathcal{G}_{n,p}$ with $p \leq 1/2$ and $p = \Omega(1)$, almost surely
$$n - o((\log_b n)^{3+\epsilon}) \leq \mathrm{bp}(G) \leq n - 2\log_b n \tag{16}$$
for $b = 1/p$ and any positive constant ϵ. Here $\mathcal{G}_{n,p}$ is the Erdős-Rényi random graph model.

References

[1] N. Alon, Bipartite decompositions of random graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B 113* (2015), 220–235.

[2] N. Alon, T. Bohman and H. Huang, More on bipartite decomposition of random graphs, *J. Graph Theory*, in press.

[3] F. Atik and P. Panigrahi, On the distance spectrum of distance regular graphs, *Lin. Alg. Appl.* **478** (2015), 256–273.

[4] L.H. Brandenburg, B. Gopinath, and R.P. Kurshan. On the Addressing Problem of Loop Switching. Bell System Technical Journal 51 (7) (1972) 1445–1469.

[5] A.E. Brouwer and W.H. Haemers, *Spectra of Graphs*, Spring Universitext 2010.

[6] F.R.K. Chung and X. Peng, Decomposition of random graphs into complete bipartite graphs, *SIAM J. Discrete Math. 30* (2016), 296–310.

[7] S.M. Cioabă, The NP-completeness of some edge-partitioning problems, M.Sc. Thesis, Queen's University at Kingston, Canada (2002), available at `http://www.math.udel.edu/~cioaba/msc.pdf`

[8] S.M. Cioabă and M. Tait, Variations on a theme of Graham and Pollak, *Discrete Math.* **13** (2013), 665–676.

[9] P. Delsarte, *An Algebraic Approach to Association Schemes and Coding Theory*, Phillips Res. Rep. Suppl. **10** (1973).

[10] R.J. Elzinga, D.A. Gregory and K. Vander Meulen, Addressing the Petersen graph, *Discrete Math.* **286** (2004), 241–244.

[11] H. Fujii and M. Sawa, An addressing scheme on complete bipartite graphs, *Ars Combin.* **86** (2008), 363–369.

[12] C. Godsil and G. Royle, *Algebraic Graph Theory*, Springer 2001.

[13] R.L. Graham and H.O. Pollak, On the addressing problem for loop switching, *Bell Syst. Tech. J.* **50** (8) (1971), 2495–2519.

[14] R.L. Graham and H.O. Pollak, On embedding graphs in squashed cubes, in *Graph theory and applications* pp. 99–110. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 303, Springer, Berlin, 1972.

[15] D.A. Gregory, B.L. Shader, and V.L. Watts, Biclique decompositions and Hermitian rank, *Linear Alg. Appl.* **292** (1999) 267–280.

[16] A.J. Hoffman, On a problem of Zaks, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **93** (2001), 271–277.

[17] G. Indulal, Distance spectrum of graph compositions, *Ars Mathematica Contemporanea 2* (2009), 93–100.

[18] J. Koolen and S.V. Shpectorov, Distance-regular graphs the distance matrix of which has only one positive eigenvalue, *Europ. J. Combin. 14* (1995), 269–275.

[19] T. Kratzke, B. Reznick and D.B. West, Eigensharp graphs: decomposition into complete bipartite subgraphs, *Trans. Amer. Math.* Soc. **308** (1988), no. 2, 637–653.

[20] J. Radhakrishnan, P. Sen, S. Vishwanathan, Depth-3 arithmetic for $S_n^2(X)$ and extensions of the Graham-Pollack theorem, in: FST TCS 2000: Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science, New Delhi, in: Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., Springer, 2000, pp. 176–187.

[21] S.D. Monson, Sylvia, N.J. Pullman, Norman, R. Rees, A survey of clique and biclique coverings and factorizations of (0,1)-matrices. *Bull. Inst. Combin. Appl.* **14** (1995), 1786.

[22] J.H. van Lint and R.M. Wilson, *A Course in Combinatorics*, Cambridge University Press, 2nd Edition, 2001.

[23] S. Watanabe, K. Ishii and M. Sawa, A q-analogue of the addressing problem of graphs by Graham and Pollak, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* **26** no.2 (2012), 527–536.

[24] P. Winkler, Proof of the squashed cube conjecture, *Combinatorica* **3** (1983), no. 1, 135–139.

[25] J. Zaks, Nearly-neighborly families of tetrahedra and the decomposition of some multigraphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **48** (1988), 147–155.

[26] X. Zhang and C. Godsil, Inertia of distance matrices of some graphs, *Discrete Math.* **313** (2013), 1655-1664.